

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephone interview on February 9, 2005. In the telephone interview, the Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed claims in the application and cited references.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. To advance the prosecution of the application, however, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 22 according to the amendments discussed during the telephone interview. As memorialized in an interview summary, the Examiner agreed that the claim amendments obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 7-14, and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,182,908 to *Devier et al.* and claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-19, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,305,162 to *Cobo et al.* As stated in the interview summary, the Examiner agreed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) would no longer apply. Thus, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5, 7-14, and 16-22 over *Devier et al.* and the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-19, and 22 over *Cobo et al.* be withdrawn in favor of allowance of pending claims 1-22.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 3, 2005

By: _____

Naoki Yoshida
Reg. No. 48,108

Reg. No. 46,508